



# Etymology of Irano-Bulgarian (Proto-Bulgarian)

## *kūr* → Bulgarian *kyp* [kur] ‘membrum virile’

### and its Indo-European cognates

Chavdar Ivaylov Georgiev from Vratsa, Bulgaria, 6.06.2022  
e-mail: [chavdar.georgiev.66@gmail.com](mailto:chavdar.georgiev.66@gmail.com)

Prof. Aharon Dolgopolsky in his scientific work “*Nostratic dictionary*” (1<sup>st</sup> edition 2008, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition 2012) reconstructs in the **Nostratic** proto-language\* two roots that are phonetically and semantically very close: I. **\*qawlV ~ \*qawElV ~ \*qawolV** ‘leg, bone of a limb’, which in the **Indo-European** proto-language yields two roots: 1. **\*kaul-/\*kul-** ‘hollow bone, ?leg’; 2. **\*kʷel-** ‘limb’, and II. **\*qułU ~ \*quLyU** ‘hollow stalk, reed, hollow (tubular) bone’, which in Proto-Indo-European yields **\*kaul-/\*kul-** ‘hollow stalk, tubular bone’ – the *second root is absent* from the 3<sup>rd</sup> edition of “*Nostratic Dictionary*”, most likely because the author considers that the *Proto-Indo-European reflexes \*kaul-/\*kul- ‘hollow bone, ?leg’ and \*kaul-/\*kul- ‘hollow stalk, tubular bone’ are identical, hence the two Nostratic roots are also identical.*<sup>1</sup> I also believe that **\*qawlV** and **\*qułU** represent *one and the same root \*qul-*, and the variant **\*qawe/ol-** with which prof. Dolgopolsky tries to explain the Proto-Indo-European **\*kaul-**, is *completely superfluous*, because **\*kaul-** is a root with **\*ā/\*a-Ablaut**.<sup>2</sup> I believe that Proto-Nostratic **\*qul-**, more precisely **\*qʰul-**\*\* ‘long hollow cylindrical object: hollow stem of a plant; hollow, tubular bone of a limb’ yields *two allomorphic Proto-Indo-European roots: 1. \*kāwl-/\*kawł- ‘hollow stem; hollow, tubular bone’ and 2. \*kʷel-/\*kʷol-/\*kʷł- ‘limb → body member’.*

Further prof. Dolgopolsky in his “*Nostratic dictionary*” reconstructs the root **\*qUł/łE** ‘penis’<sup>3</sup>. Since **\*qułU ~ \*quLyU** yields Proto-Indo-European **\*kaul-/\*kul-**, it’s obvious that **\*qUł/łE** can yield *the same Proto-*

\**The most ancient language of the “intelligent man” (*Homo sapiens*) at the time of his dispersal across the expanses of Eurasia and North Africa – it is called “**Nostratic**” from Latin *nostrās, -ātis* ‘our native’, it is dated approximately 15 – 12 thousand years b.C., i.e. at the end of Ancient Stone Age (Paleolithic), at the time of mammoths, cave bears and cave lions.*

\*\*I prefer the *simpler and phonetically more plausible* transcription of prof. Allan Bomhard in his capital scientific work “*A comprehensive introduction to Nostratic comparative linguistics (with special reference to Indo-European)*”, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition 2018, instead of the unreasonably complicated transcription of prof. Dolgopolsky.

<sup>1</sup> Dolgopolsky, Aharon: *Nostratic dictionary*, McDonald institute for archaeological research/ University of Cambridge, Cambridge 2008, № 1914: **\*qawlV** or **\*qawElV**, p.1792-94;

№ 1918: **\*qułU** or **\*quLyU**, p.1795-96; ed. 2012, № 1914: **\*qawolV**, p.1987-89

<sup>2</sup> Gąsiorowski, Piotr: *Another long grade: non-canonical ablaut involving PIE \*ā*, presentation, Leiden 2013

*Carrasquer Vidal*, Miguel: *PIE \*a*, [www.academia.edu](http://www.academia.edu), 2015, p.1: Skt. *kúlyam*, Latv. *kaūls*, Lith. *káulas*, Gk. *kaulós*

<sup>3</sup> Dolgopolsky, Aharon: *Nostratic dictionary*, ed. 2008, № 1918a: **\*qUł/łE** ‘penis, ?vulva’, p.1796; ed. 2012, № 1918: **\*qUł/łE** ‘penis’, p.1991

*Indo-European reflex: Nostratic \*q<sup>h</sup>ul- → Indo-European \*kāwl-/ \*kawl- and \*kʷel-/ \*kʷol-/ \*kʷl-. It is surprising that prof. Dolgopolsky does not propose any Proto-Indo-European reflexes of \*q<sup>h</sup>ul-, i.e. q<sup>h</sup>ul- ‘membrum virile, penis’! Most likely he is misled by the presumption of the majority of linguists that Ancient Greek **καυλός** [kawlós], Latin **caulis** [káwlis] ‘penis’ (*both possessing such meaning as part of the common semantics*), Bulgarian **widespread** word-taboo **kyp** [kur] and Khotan-Saka **kūra-** ‘penis’ (*in Bulgarian and Khotan-Saka the mentioned meaning is only*) are *botanical and zoological metaphors* – the Greek and the Latin words are *metaphors* of **καυλός** ‘stem, trunk’ and **caulis** ‘stalk, cob (of cabbage)’ and the Bulgarian word is a *metaphor* of Old-Bulgarian **којръ** [kúrъ] ‘cock, rooster’. I will immediately refute such *frivolous presumption* – *what is the guarantee that the reflexes of q<sup>h</sup>ul- ‘membrum virile’ listed by prof. Dolgopolsky do not have a metaphorical meaning???*! If the meaning of the Bulgarian word is metaphorical, it’s normal to use it also in its *direct* sense, but Bulgarians say “**nemel**” [peté] in the sense of ‘cock, rooster’. The *metaphorical semantics cannot be an argument against the linguistic kinship of καυλός* [kawlós], **caulis** [káwlis], **kyp** [kur] and **kūra-** ‘membrum virile’, provided that these four words can be derived from a common Proto-Indo-European root! There is no way to positively determine whether \*q<sup>h</sup>ul- ‘hollow stem of a plant; hollow, tubular bone of limb’ and q<sup>h</sup>ul- ‘penis’ represent two separate roots with identical pronunciation (homonyms) or it’s the same root with primary meaning ‘hollow stem; tubular bone’ and secondary metaphorical meaning ‘penis’ – more important is *the very fact that in three major groups of Indo-European languages (Aryan, Greek and Italic) there are words for membrum virile that from the point of view of every professional linguist are obvious cognates (etymologically related)!!!* Based on the idea of \*ā/\*a-Ablaut of prof. Piotr Gąsiorowski and Miguel Carrasquer Vidal, I reconstruct a Proto-Indo-European **root-noun** (Nom.sg.) \*kāwl, (Gen.sg.) \*kāwl-es ‘**hollow stem; tubular bone; membrum virile**’, to which I join the possessive suffix \*-ó- and so we get \*kawl-ó-s → Ancient Greek **καυλός** [kawlós] ‘penis’; I join the suffix \*-i- and so we get \*kawl-i-s → Latin **caulis** [káwlis] ‘membrum virile’.<sup>4</sup>*

Contemporary Bulgarian widespread word-taboo **kyp** [kur] ‘penis’ also originates from Proto-Indo-European \*kawl-ó-s: \*kawlós → Proto-Indo-Iranian = Aryan \*kawlás ~ \*kawrás → Proto-Iranian \*kawráh → (taut syllabic Aryan diphthong \*aw before stressed last syllable → Irano-

<sup>4</sup> Adams, J. N.: *The Latin sexual vocabulary*, Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd., London 1982, p.26-27, 72

Bulgarian = Proto-Bulgarian **\*ow** → **\*ū**) Irano-Bulgarian **\*kowráh** → **\*kūráh** → **\*kūrəh** → **\*kūrə** → **kūr** ‘*membrum virile*’ → Bulgarian **kyp** [kur]. Proto-Iranian **\*kawráh** → Khotan-Saka **kūra-** and some *present-day Central Iranian dialect words for a penis* – Nā’īni **kur**, K<sup>w</sup>ānsāri (Khunsari) **kur** ‘penis’ are the *direct cognates* of Irano-Bulgarian **kūr** → Bulgarian **kyp**.<sup>5</sup> Today’s Bulgarian word **kyp** *has nothing to do with Old-Bulgarian **коуρъ** [kúru]* ‘cock’ – **коуρъ** was used *simply as euphemism*, i.e. *as a substitute for an “indecent” word*, due to an *external sound match (homonymy)* with the Irano-Bulgarian word.

The Proto-Nostratic **\*q<sup>h</sup>ul-** → Proto-Indo-European **\*k<sup>w</sup>el-/\*k<sup>w</sup>ol-**, to which is joined a suffix **\*-yo-**, yields **\*k<sup>w</sup>ól-yo-s** → Aryan **\*kályas** ~ **\*káryas** → Proto-Iranian **\*káryah** → Proto-Middle-Iranian (with metathesis **\*ary** → **\*ayr**) **\*káyra** → Middle-Persian **kēr**, New-Persian **kīr** ‘*membrum virile*’. Aryan **\*káryas** yields Balkan-Gypsy (Romani) **kar** ‘penis’.<sup>6</sup>

The Proto-Indo-European **\*k<sup>w</sup>el-** with a *doubled initial consonant (reduplication)* yields a nominative base **\*k<sup>w</sup>i-k<sup>w</sup>el-** or **\*k<sup>w</sup>ə-k<sup>w</sup>el-** (*i-reduplication* ~ **ə-** “schwa-secundum”-reduplication) and after joining to it the thematic **\*-o-**, one gets **\*k<sup>w</sup>i-k<sup>w</sup>él-o-s ~ \*k<sup>w</sup>ə-k<sup>w</sup>él-o-s** → Aryan **\*čičálas** → Romani **čičalo** [tʃitʃaló] ‘*membrum virile*’.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Bailey, Harold: *Dictionary of Khotan Saka*, Cambridge University press, Cambridge/London/N.York/Melbourne 1979, p.62

Cheung, Johnny: *Etymological dictionary of the Iranian verb*, Brill, Leiden/Boston 2007, p.250

<sup>6</sup> The author of this scientific article knows the pronunciation and meaning of Balkan-Gypsy **kar** ‘penis’ from his Roma students.

<sup>7</sup> Zoller, Claus Peter: *Aspects of the early history of Romani*, Acta Orientalia 2010: 71, p.243 – 312 (**čičalo** ‘penis’ – p.271)